



MEMORANDUM

Date: June 18, 2002

To: James Ndirangu, USAID/Kenya SO 5 Team Leader

CC: Charles Oluchina, NRM Program Assistant

Re: Summary Report of the June 17 CORE Extension Strategy Working Session post the CORE Mid-term Evaluations, per contract requirements for USAID Contract: AEP-I-00-00-00024-00, Task Order No. 810

From: MSI CORE Mid-term Evaluation Team:
Drew Lent, Team Leader, Strategy and OD Specialist
Dr. Steven Njuguna, NRM Evaluation and Policy Specialist
James Wahome, NRM Evaluation and OD Specialist

Please find here our report of the proceedings of the CORE Strategy Working Session that we conducted with members of the CORE PMT and SO 5 partners at the Safari Park Hotel on June 17, 2002. The body of this report summarizes the major conclusions made by the group. We have appended the following supporting documents to this report:

1. The meeting participant list, and
2. The meeting agenda.

The strategy session was successful in addressing the major goals and objectives of the meeting. The stated session goal was to develop a strategy for the next phase of CORE project in light of the mid-term evaluation recommendations and post-review management decisions.

Specific meeting objectives were:

1. To share technical approaches and new information relative to organizational development (OD) and enterprise development (ED), NRM (tools and planning) and Policy (enabling environment).
2. To identify priority activities and NEW targets to be pursued by CORE partners.
3. To discuss and formulate a strategy for the next phase of the CORE project that will enable partners to draft CA amendments to cover an extension of activities for the next 2 or 3 years.

USAID/CORE CORE STRATEGY WORKING SESSION

Safari Park Hotel, Monday, 17 June 2002, 9.00 a.m. to 5.00 p.m.

PROCEEDINGS

Introduction

During this Strategy Working Session USAID assembled a group of CORE and SO 5 partners to discuss the outcomes of several consultative meetings that were held after the Mid-term Evaluation Debriefing session at KWS on May 18. The consultative meetings were used to analyze the mid-term review team's recommendations and make management decisions on the following critical elements of the "way forward" (a strategy to guide the remaining years of the CORE program). The issues discussed included:

- Phase-out and redefinition of focal area activities;
- The mix of partner focus per focal area and CORE team relationships;
- Plans to implement NRM planning in concert with on-going the enterprise development (ED) and organizational development (OD) activities;
- Supporting an enabling environment for conservation (SO 5's IR 5.5); and
- Articulation of a USAID/CORE exit strategies.

Following the participants' introductions (see the participant list on page 11) the presence of other SO 5 partners and personnel was acknowledged. These participants included: Robert Buzzard of the Forest Management Initiative (FMI), Nick Georgiadis of Mpala Research Centre (MRC), and Tom Bayer of Kenya Coast Management Initiative (KCMI). These three persons had not participated in the prior consultative meetings and were invited to the workshop because of the roles they will play in the SO 5 program. The workshop discussions and decisions reached on key issues are summarized below.

Focal areas

In view of certain reduced funding for the SO 5 program, it will be necessary to consider what activities to excise in focal areas. It will also be necessary to consider the value of integrated NRM and not just wildlife. The transition will have to be done carefully to avoid confusing local communities. USAID/CORE identified Laikipia/Samburu, the Coast, and Taita-Taveta as high-intensity areas of CORE engagement. The SO 5 team leader noted the importance of Laikipia/Samburu and the Coast focal areas as good opportunities for implementing integrated NRM. Amboseli will be retained as low-intensity area for CORE. In Masai Mara, CORE will wrap up its involvement with provision for 6 to 8 months to conclude current activities.

Partner Focus

In Laikipia and Amboseli, AWF will carry out most of the activities with the exception of working with the forums (OD work to be conducted by Pact). AWF has a commitment in Laikipia and Amboseli coupled with the presence of the Heartland Program. Pact will retain its role on building regional forums and will undertake OD work in all five focal area forums, including the Marine Forum.

The EDF would be used as incentives to facilitate the enterprises to move into loan arrangements. The details of modifying the EDF still need to be worked out. One option would be to provide loan guarantees. There will be an additional US \$ 0.5 million is available for loans, not for grants.

AWF and Pact will present USAID with proposals of modified program descriptions (to amend their activities and set new targets) in order to facilitate the amendments of their CAs. The deadline for submission of proposals is 1 July 2002. The amendments will include the stipulation that USAID will have more substantial involvement in sub-grantee selection. USAID will not give blank approvals of key personnel.

Team Relationships

Organizational development support of enterprises in Laikipia will be carried out by AWF with backstopping from Pact. At the Coast, OD for ED would be carried out by Pact with backstopping from AWF. A large amount of USAID/Kenya Forest Project financial resources will be used in Laikipia. This will free Pact resources that can be used in Taita-Taveta. CORAL (USAID/Global funding) resources will be used in Amboseli.

The training needs assessment, OD and ED activities need to be harmonized in terms of approach and sequencing. Training for Enterprise Officers on how to administer the OCA tool will be provided by Pact in order to build capacity across partner teams and limit overlap and duplication. Joint work plan sessions will be retained as a key process of spelling out and sequencing project activities by the teams.

At the Coast, KCMI, FMI and CORE will work cooperatively to implement activities. There will be two project components at the Coast, a terrestrial one and a marine one. The section of the Coast in which the projects will be implemented stretches from Malindi to Shimoni. A funding of US \$ 2 million has been obligated for NRM work at the Coast. CORE will be called upon to participate in OD and ED work at the Coast.

Organizational Development / Enterprise Development

The consultative meeting on OD/ED considered the following issues:

- Technical needs on OD interventions;
- Exit strategy;
- Sustainability (governance, ownership);
- Tourism technical needs;
- Access to financial services; and
- Supporting NRM tools.

Under sustainability, a funding calendar for EDF disbursements should be prepared. Marketing of enterprise products will need serious attention in the remaining phase of CORE. In addition, the following issues need to be addressed:

- Benefit-sharing mechanisms;
- Study tours; and
- Collaborative linkages.

Specialized training is needed for the Laikipia Wildlife Forum's Community Liaison Officers (CLOs) on use of:

- An adapted OCA tool;
- Strategic planning;
- NRM planning; and
- The development of funding proposals.

CLOs will conduct follow up sessions to assess the impact of training activities. The possibility of recruitment and training of CLOs for other NRM forums like in Taita-Taveta and the Coast could be explored.

Pact will need to transfer OD/ED sequencing ability to AWF staff during a training workshop. It is also worth noting other OD tools used by other partners, e.g., SAMED's work in TNA, mentoring, visioning, strategic planning and leadership training.

With regard to governance, the question to ask is. "How accountability is addressed at the community level?" What remedies should be instituted? Capacity building in financial management will help in establishing checks, balances and controls. Application of group ranch bylaws could also be applied. In serious cases of misappropriation, legal recourse should be pursued. It is important to maintain PMT and PSC communications ensure support especially on issues of governance.

Focal Area Teams (FATs)

FATs are working in one area only, i.e., Amboseli. FATs are important and should made to work in other focal areas as well. It was asked, "How could FAT functioning be improved? How should their functions be operationalized?" It was decided that the lead CORE partners working in each area would take the lead in making for meeting logistics are addressed. For example, AWF should take the lead in Laikipia. Dates for the FAT meetings should be set in advance.

Graduating EDF

A team is working on ways and means of graduating the EDF. The bulk of EDF funds will be converted to loan support incentive and a small percentage will remain for small grant making to communities to facilitate deal making. EDF grants should lead to development of stronger linkages with micro-finance institutions. This is seen as a more efficient use of EDF funds. In order improve efficiency, there will be need to draft guidelines/code of ethics/conduct as well as a system of monitoring compliance. Due diligence should apply to both the large businesses and small operators. Over the next few years, small grants should support advisory services and legal assistance. No more Koiya's and Kijabe's (massive infrastructure projects) should be supported. EDF could be used to guarantee loans to CBOs. A micro-financing mechanism should be established to ensure the sustainability of enterprises supported by CORE.

Marketing of enterprises needs to be improved. Many of these enterprises require different skills, roles and linkages currently available within CORE. This initiative will be lead by AWF. It was agreed that the products to be marketed should go beyond ecotourism, for example, traditional forest products, gum arabica, aloe, etc. There is need to broaden the options for enterprises.

Access to legal services by the communities is crucial. The legal advisor at AWF currently provides legal representation to communities as and when needed. The issue of liabilities to ecotourism enterprises was raised and the need for addressing it was identified and modifications in the CAs ought to reflect this.

Enabling Environment (Policy)

The key policy areas important to CORE are:

- Community empowerment and devolution of wildlife management responsibilities;
- Diversification of options for community-based conservation mechanisms and enterprises;
- Establishment of a national land trust; and
- Development of a land use policy.

DFID is supporting the Kenya Land Alliance on land use policy issues through its PEAK program. Mechanisms should be sought to collaborate with DFID on this. KWS has prepared a draft wildlife policy paper to be presented to the KWS Board on 27 June 2002. KWS will subsequently solicit public input to the policy changes. CORE should support this process. Regional land use plans (NRM planning) once prepared can contribute to national land use plan. AWF should move ahead and advance the idea of Land Trust.

NRM Planning

The Strategy Working Session emphasized the need to develop approaches that go beyond NRM planning. During the next phase of CORE, particular attention will be given to implementation of various management interventions. These interventions would act as pilot activities to create learning points for adaptive management. AWF would conduct NRM planning in Laikipia/Samburu and Amboseli while Pact would continue with its NRM activities in Taita-Taveta and the Coast.

A list of NRM tools was considered. This included: 1) land set asides for ecotourism and wildlife; 2) nature focused enterprise development; 3) spin-off enterprises; 4) easements; 5) buffer zones; 6) land trusts; 7) forums/networks; 8) focused commodity support; 9) woodlots and plantations; 10) agroforestry; 11) M&E systems and databases; 12) conservation leases; 13) NRM planning (forest, wildlife protected areas, marine protected areas; 14) strategic planning; 15) OD tools and skills; 16) marketing development; 17) product development; 18) water harvesting; 19) co-management; 20) domestication of plant and animal species; 21) wildlife cropping; 22) bird shooting; 23) tree nurseries; 24) fodder banks; 25) restoration; 26) livestock management, etc. LWF was given as an example of a forum that was addressing a broad range of issues including livestock management.

CORE Partner Exit Strategies

Lessons learned from COBRA project should be considered in developing a CORE exit strategy to avoid repeating the similar mistakes. Amendments in the CAs should address the exit strategies especially in Masai Mara where CORE will be wrapping up soon. In Imbirikani, efforts should be made to build upon the gains achieved so far, especially community acceptance of improved NRM. In other areas, the development of exit strategies for each of the activities will be part of the work plans. New projects should have exit

strategies built in them. In addition, developing exit strategies it will be necessary to identify new partners and/or scale down the project's activities.

Performance Targets

Partner group discussions were organized to consider performance targets for the years 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005. These working groups were 1) KWS; 2) AWF Coalition – including FMI; 3) Pact Coalition; and 4) USAID, FMI and KCMI. A summary PMP for SO 5 table was used to record the agreed targets (see Table 1 below).

Next Steps

- Within the next two weeks, CORE coalitions will submit amended program descriptions;
- Funds obligated would be released by end of July 2002;
- KWS will continue with the present arrangements, prepare work plans and seek agreement on proposed activities.

Conclusion

The SO 5 Team Leader thanked the participants for their spirited participation and useful contributions. The Review Team was thanked for their work in helping craft a good integrated SO 5 Program.

Table 1. Performance Targets for SO 5 (New changes are highlighted)

Result	Performance Indicator	Data Source	Year	Baseline value	Target	Actual
Strategic Objective 5: Improved NRM in targeted biodiverse areas by and for stakeholders	#1. Land use change in target areas (ha)	CORE/KWS database, maps from KWS GIS Unit, KCMI, FMI	1996	KCMI: TBD	NA	NA
			Pre- Sept. '99	CORE: 1,772,206 [sub. PAs]	NA	NA
			2000	CORE: --- KCMI: --- FMI: NA	NA NA NA	1,777,500 [sub. PAs] NA NA
			2001	CORE: --- KCMI --- FMI: 90,113	X+ 35,000 TBD NA	TBD TBD NA
			2002	CORE: --- KCMI: --- FMI: ---	X+92,000 TBD TBD	TBD TBD TBD
			2003	CORE: --- KCMI: --- FMI: ---	X+112,000 TBD TBD	TBD TBD TBD
				CORE: --- KCMI: --- FMI---	TBD TBD TBD	TBD TBD TBD
				CORE: --- KCMI: --- FMI: --	TBD TBD TBD	TBD TBD TBD

	# 2. Number of stakeholders benefiting from involvement in improved NRM	CORE/KWS database, KCMI, FMI [a-m: annual number of <u>male</u> stakeholders <u>directly</u> involved and benefiting; a-f: annual number of <u>female</u> stakeholders <u>directly</u> involved and benefiting; b: annual number of stakeholders <u>indirectly</u> involved and benefiting]	2000	a-m: 1,974 M&F [disag. + KCMI data] a-f: TBD [from above] b: 16,225 + KCMI	NA	NA
			2001	---	a-m: 3,000 + KCMI a-f: 1,000 + KCMI b: 18,000 + KCMI	a-m: TBD a-f: TBD b: TBD
			2002	---	a-m: CORE + KCMI + FMI a-f: add 3 targets b: add 3 targets	a-m: TBD a-f: TBD b: TBD
			2003	---	a-m: TBD a-f: TBD b: TBD	a-m: TBD a-f: TBD b: TBD
			2004	---	a-m: TBD a-f: TBD b: TBD	a-m: TBD a-f: TBD b: TBD
			2005	---	a-m: TBD a-f: TBD b: TBD	a-m: TBD a-f: TBD b: TBD
Intermediate Result 5.1: Site specific initiatives for NRM implemented outside PAs	#3. Number of NRM initiatives successfully implemented in target areas	CORE/KWS database, KCMI, FMI	1999	0	NA	0
			2000	---	22	22
			2001	---	25 + KCMI	TBD
			2002	---	33 + KCMI	TBD
			2003	---	35 + KCMI + 5	TBD
			2004	---	CORE + KCMI + FMI	TBD
			2005	---	CORE + KCMI + FMI	TBD
Sub-IR 5.1.1: Appropriate NRM tools/technologies adopted	#4. Number of conservation tools/technologies in use by targeted stakeholders	CORE/KWS database, KCMI, FMI	2000	7	NA	7
			2001	---	10	TBD
			2002	---	11 + KCMI + FMI	TBD
			2003	---	12 + KCMI + FMI	TBD
			2004	---	CORE 5 new ones + KCMI + FMI	TBD
			2005	---	CORE + KCMI + FMI	TBD
Sub-IR 5.1.2: Integrated NRM plans implemented	#5. Number of integrated NRM plans implemented	CORE/KWS database, KCMI, FMI [A: Cumulative number of NRM plans <u>initiated</u> ;	2000	A: 0 B: 0	A: 0 B: 0	A: 0 B: 0
			2001	---	A: 1 B: 0	A: TBD B: TBD
			2002	---	A: 3 + KCMI + 1 FMI B: 2 + KCMI	A: TBD B: TBD

		B: Cumulative number of NRM plans operational]	2003	---	A: 2 + KCMI + FMI B: 5 + KCMI + FMI	A: TBD B: TBD
			2004	---	A: 2 CORE + KCMI + FMI B: 3 CORE + KCMI + FMI	A: TBD B: TBD
			2005	---	A: 0 CORE + KCMI + FMI B: CORE + 5 KCMI + FMI	A: TBD B: TBD
Sub-IR 5.1.3: Improved local decision-making based on monitoring and analysis	#6. Functionality of databases available to targeted local decision-makers	SO5 Partner databases [Indexed score]	2000	NA	NA	NA
			2001	Baseline score of existing databases pending	NA	NA
			2002	---	NA	NA
			2003	---	50% of index score [score of 6 out of 12]	TBD
			2004	---	NA	NA
			2005	---	75% of index score [a score of 9 out of 12]	TBD
Sub-IR 5.1.4: Nature-focused business practices improved	#7. Financial benefits to communities from nature-focused businesses	AWF Data Form 3a, KCMI, FMI [Kenya Shillings]	2000	0	NA	0
			2001	---	TBD	TBD
			2002	---	TBD	TBD
			2003	---	TBD	TBD
			2004	---	TBD	TBD
Sub-IR 5.1.5: Awareness of incentives for NRM increased	#8. Stakeholder awareness of incentives for NRM	CORE Socio-economic survey to be conducted in late 2001 and mid-2003	2001	TBD: Pending survey results. Disadvantaged groups; Geographical Area; Type of incentive/benefit	NA	TBD: Pending survey
			2003	---	TBD: Pending survey	TBD
			2005	---	TBD	TBD

Sub-IR 5.1.5.1: Wildlife policy revised and wildlife conservation and management bill passed	#9. Status of policy and legislation encouraging community incentives for NRM	CORE, KCMI, FMI performance reports [nominal class data list]	2000	ACTUAL CORE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 2 Wildlife forums build advocacy into their mandates ➤ KWS/stakeholders wildlife utilization guidelines ➤ KWS pilot wildlife cropping evaluation ➤ KWS/community meetings on wildlife utilization issues resulting in a "policy framework" ➤ Kasighau Trust communities lobby for reclassification of a settlement area to a conservation area 		
			2001	CORE - TBD KCMI <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ KCMI report on legal and institutional framework for coastal management ➤ KCMI conducts a marine forum to build advocacy of coastal associations /organizations into their mandates ➤ NES "coastal study tour" for key GOK decision-makers ➤ KCMI/GOK directors awareness workshop to develop coastal management guidelines. 		
			2002	CORE, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Ideas collected from stakeholders, July 2002 KCMI, FMI - TBD		
			2003	CORE, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 1st draft of wildlife policy, July 2003 KCMI, FMI - TBD		
			2004	CORE, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 2nd draft of wildlife policy KCMI, FMI - TBD		
			2005	CORE, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Draft forwarded to AG, wildlife policy in Parliament, policy approved by end of 2005 KCMI, FMI - TBD		
Sub-IR 5.3.1: Improved availability and analysis of data for decision-making	#10. Percentage of targeted KWS parks and units utilizing new M&E tracking systems	KWS M&E database	2000	0	NA	0
			2001	---	10	TBD
			2002	---	30	TBD
			2003	---	50	TBD
			2004	---	75	TBD
	#11. Functionality of internal KWS databases for monitoring and evaluation	CORE/KWS Functional database index	2000	NA	NA	NA
			2001	Pending	Pending	TBD
			2002	---	30	NA
			2003	---	50	TBD
			2004	---	75	NA
			2005	---	90% of index score (9 out of 12 scores)	TBD

Intermediate Result 5.4: Environmental advocacy strengthened	#12. Capacity of constituency groups in advocacy /dialogue	CORE, KCMI, FMI -using Pact Advocacy Index Score	2001	CORE: Pending	NA	Pending
			2002	Revised baseline to incorporate KCMI and FMI	Pending	TBD
			2003	---	Regional forums	TBD
			2004	---	National forum	TBD
			2005	---	Publication of CORE case study	TBD
Sub-IR 5.4.1: Constituencies for NR conservation established	#13. Organizational capacity of targeted CBOs and Forums	CORE, KCMI, FMI. OCA tool [average aggregate OCA score] A: CBOs brought in the current year B: CBOs brought in previous years	2000	A: 1.5 B: NA	NA	A: 1.5 B: NA
			2001	---	A: 1.5 B: 1.5 to 2.0	A: TBD B: TBD
			2002	---	A: 1.5 B: 2.0 to 3.0	A: TBD B: TBD
			2003	---	A: 1.5 B: 2.4 to 3.5	A: TBD B: TBD
			2004	---	A: 1.5 B: TBD	A: TBD B: TBD
			2005	---	A: 1.5 B: TBD	A: TBD B: TBD

APPENDIX: Participant List

No.	Name	Institution/Association	Position
1.	Anyonge, Munira K.	KWS	KWS/CWS CORE Leader
2.	Bayer, Tom	URI/CRC	KCMI 2
3.	Brown, Meg	USAID/Kenya	ABEO Director
4.	Buzzard, Robert	KWS/USAID	Forestry/Range Rehab Advisor
5.	Cowles, Paul	Pact	Pact/CORE Director
6.	Gathinji, Irene	Pact	Pact/CORE Program Deputy Director
7.	Georgiadis, Dr. Nick	Mpala Research Center	Director
8.	Guchu-Katee, Christine	AWF	Senior Program Officer
9.	Gwashure, Isadore	AWF	Director
10.	Inamdar, Neel	ACC	Director
11.	Kagiri, Joachim	KWS	Assistant Director, CWS
12.	Kariuki, Anthony	Pact	NRM Officer
13.	Karimi, Irene	PwC	Grants Manager
14.	Morara, Jasper	EAWLS	Program Officer
15.	Mwangi, Mary	SAMED	Programme Manager
16.	Ndirangu, James	USAID/Kenya	SO 5 Team Leader
17.	Ndung'u, Margaret	KWS	M&E Officer
18.	Njagi, Jeff	SAMED	Director
19.	Ntiati, Paul	AWF	Heartlands Coordinator
20.	Okudo, Joe Robert	ACC	Head of Program
21.	Oluchina, Charles	USAID/Kenya	ABEO - NRM Program Assistant
22.	Polidoro, Bill	Pact	Country Director
23.	Steenstrup, Barbara	PwC	EDF Director

APPENDIX: USAID/CORE CORE Strategy Working Session

REVISED AGENDA

Date: June 17th 2002

Time: 9.00 a.m. - 4.00 p.m.

Venue: Safari Park Hotel

Facilitator: Drew Lent and Review team

Working Session Goal

To develop a concrete strategic plan for the next phase of CORE project in light of the mid-term recommendations and post-review management decisions.

Working Session Objectives

1. To share technical approaches and new information relative to OD/ED, NRM (tools and planning) and Policy (enabling environment).
2. To identify priority activities and NEW targets to be pursued by CORE partners.
3. To discuss and formulate a strategy for the next phase of the CORE project that will enable partners to draft CA amendments to cover an extension of activities for the next 2 or 3 years.

Expected outcomes

1. Consolidated technical approaches for project activities implementation.
2. List of priority actions and revised project targets for CORE.
3. New strategy and plan of action for CORE implementation to inform CA/grant modifications

REVISED PROGRAM CORE EXTENSION STRATEGY WORKING SESSION

Time	Activity
8.45 -9.15 a.m.	Arrival and Call to order
9.15 -9.45 a.m.	Review/modification of workshop goals and objectives
9.45 - 10.15 a.m.	Presentations of PSC/PMT management decisions post-mid-term evaluation recommendationshandout <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Focal areas• Partner focus• Team relationships• NRM planning Identification of questions for implementation
10.15 - 10.30 a.m.	Tea break
10.30 - 11.15 a.m.	Presentations of technical approaches and new information relative to: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• OD/ED,

- Policy (enabling environment)
- NRM (tools and planning)

11.15 - 1.00 p.m.Extension strategic development

- Exit strategy
- Partner “hand-off”

Partners Group work on

- Priority action items
- Performance targets

1.00 p.m.- 2.00 p.m.Lunch

2.00 - 3.00 p.m.Continued Partner group discussions

3.00 - 3.30 p.m.Reports from working groups discussions on key strategic direction

3.30- 3.45 p.m. Tea/Coffee break

3.45 - 4.30 p.m.Workplan preparation and adoption

4.30 - 5.00 p.m.General conclusions and Final comments from USAID and PMT